

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,751,513 to Spruit ("Spruit) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-0017833 to Yamada et al. ("Yamada"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Spruit does not refer to the period T_1 , accordingly Spruit does not teach the claimed invention. Yamada fails to cure the deficiencies of Spruit. Yamada discloses a relationship $0.125T \leq z \leq 1t$, where z corresponds to T_1 of the present invention. This range does not include $T_1 \neq 0$, as in the amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Spruit and Yamada.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable of the combination of Spruit and Yamada along with claim 1 and on its own merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 3, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spruit and Yamada et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,109 to Nakamura ("Nakamura"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3, 7, and 8 are allowable over the combination of Spruit and Yamada for at least the reasons provided above. Nakamura does not disclose or suggest the relationship $T_1 \neq 0$. Thus, the Nakamura et al. cannot remedy the deficiency of the combination of Spruit and Yamada. Claims 3, 7 and 8 are therefore allowable over the combination of Spruit, Yamada, and Nakamura. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spruit and Yamada et al. and further in view of respective references. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 4, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the combination of Spruit and Yamada for at least the reasons presented above and on their own merits. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 7 and are allowable over the combination of Spruit and Yamada for at least the reasons presented above and on their own merits. The cited references fail to cure the deficiencies of Spruit and Yamada. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicants note that the Office Action pointed out that the Miyamoto reference discloses in column 9, lines 46-49 that T_c (which corresponds to T_1 in the present invention) can be a value from $0T$ to $2.5T$. However, the Miyamoto reference teaches against a value of $0T$ in column 9, lines 54-55: "in the case where T_c is $0T$, the jitter value is 18%, which changes to 8% when T_c is $1.5T$." Miyamoto teaches a reduced jitter at higher T . In contrast, the present application discloses in paragraph 0046 that T_1 "preferably be equal to zero ($T_1=0$)," which is directly opposite the teachings of Miyamoto. Thus, the present invention is not taught by Miyamoto.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/694,939

Amendment dated

Reply to Office Action of February 21, 2007

Docket No.: R2184.0268/P268

Dated: June 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Anthony M. Briggs, Jr.

Registration No.: 52,654

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant